

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
NATHANIEL JONES,

Plaintiff,

- against -

NATIONAL COMMUNICATION AND
SURVEILLANCE NETWORKS,
STATE OF NEW YORK,
STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
STATE OF DELAWARE,
STATE OF MARYLAND,
STATE OF VIRGINIA,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
STATE OF GEORGIA,
JOHN DOE, in his official capacity,
JANE DOE, in her official capacity,
NEW YORK POLICE DEPARTMENT,
NEW YORK CITY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,
NEW YORK FIRE DEPARTMENT,
CITY OF NEW YORK,
CITY OF MT. VERNON,
MT. VERNON POLICE DEPARTMENT,
MT. VERNON FIRE DEPARTMENT,
MT. VERNON BOARD OF EDUCATION,
WILLIE MCCRAY, in his official capacity,
M.H. DUDLEY, individually,
THOMAS MONROE TURNER, in his official capacity,
THOMAS MONROE TURNER, individually,
KIRK SOOKDEEO, individually,
LARRY BARNES, in his individual capacity,
LARRY BARNES, individually,
MET FOOD,
WESTERN BEEF,
SHOPRITE,
FOX FIVE NEWS,
GERARD JOSEPH, in his official capacity,
GERARD JOSEPH, individually,
RAPHAEL JOSEPH, in his official capacity,
RAPHAEL JOSEPH, individually,
CARTER BROTHERS,
KING TELESERVICES,

ORDER DENYING
MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

05 Civ. 3461 (AKH)

OCWEN BANK,	:
NATION BANC,	:
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,	:
CENTER FOR DISEASE CONTROL,	:
FEDERAL CONTRACTORS,	:
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE,	:
ROSICKI ROSICKI & ASSOCIATES,	:
BRUCE JOHNSON, in his official capacity,	:
BRUCE JOHNSON, individually,	:
GOLDEN WEXLER AND SARNESIS,	:
HENRY SOLLY,	:
PATRICIA SOLLY,	:
VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,	:
HOME BOX OFFICE, INC.,	:
	Defendants. :
-----X	


ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN, U.S.D.J.:

By Order dated January 12, 2006 (the “January 12 Order”), I dismissed plaintiff’s Amended Complaint against all defendants. Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the dismissal of the Amended Complaint on January 23, 2006 and a Notice of Appeal on February 10, 2006. For the reasons stated below, plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration is denied.

Plaintiff’s claim that he is entitled to a default judgment against the certain defendants that did not respond to the Amended Complaint is without merit. As I stated in the January 12 Order, since those defendants were similarly situated to the certain defendants who did respond to the Amended Complaint, the claims against them were dismissed as well. Plaintiff has failed to introduce any new evidence that would entitle him to the relief sought. Accordingly, the Motion for Reconsideration is denied.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York
November 16, 2007



ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN
United States District Judge